

tions. We are being asked to believe, that he would risk his good name, honor, reputation, and bank account. Moreover, we are asked to believe that he would do so at a time when hundreds of thousands of men and women who had fought in the war, or otherwise been directly involved with it, including Barlow, were still alive, and when the lie, therefore, was quite susceptible of being challenged and exposed by eyewitnesses or others who were conversant with the facts.

Let us talk about the Potter dinner party a little bit. This is the second half of Gordon's accounts. If the second half is true, then the first half must also be true, because the second half is entirely dependent upon the first half. Do we have any reason to doubt the second half? None. It is a perfectly plausible story. Furthermore, there were witnesses, i.e., other dinner guests. If the conversation and its effects, as described by Gordon, are fanciful, these witnesses could have and might have exposed it as fraudulent. Again, is it reasonable to suppose that Gordon would risk his priceless credibility for such a piece of fluff? For that matter, is it reasonable to suppose that he would invent the whole story? For what purpose? The second half of the story is dependent upon the first half, as said, but the opposite is not true. If the first half is a fraud, there is no necessity to add the second half; it is gratuitous.

The veracity of Gordon's account receives further support from the story's circulation from at least 1879, seventeen years before Barlow's death, yet it was never contradicted by Barlow. It is simply incredible that the story, as told by Gordon, and as it appeared in the publications antedating 1896, would not have come to Barlow's attention in that seventeen year period. That includes Gordon's speech (*Last Days*), which was given all over the country and which surely appeared in print while Barlow still lived. Further support for the story's veracity is that Barlow and Gordon met on at least two occasions after the war, once at Potter's dinner party (1879) and again at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the battle (1888). By the time of the second meeting, the story had been in circulation for at least nine years. On the occasion of that meeting, the *New York Times* wrote that:

The two men met for the second time in 25 years and the meeting was rather affecting. Gen. Barlow was left on the field on the first day's fight. He was found by Gen. Gordon, who not only saw that he was taken care of, but allowed Mrs. Barlow to come through the lines to nurse her husband.

That the story appeared in such a prominent newspaper as the *New York Times*, which, living in New York, Barlow must surely have read, gave him an excellent opportunity to denounce it as false, but of course he did not.

Still further support for the veracity of the story is Gordon's statements, in both *Reminiscences* and *Last Days*, that Barlow had heard of the death of Gordon's cousin, General J.B. Gordon of North Carolina, who was killed near Richmond in the summer of 1864, and, because of the identical initials, had assumed that this was the J. B. Gordon who had assisted him at Gettysburg. How would Gordon know that? The only reasonable answer, of course, is that Barlow told him. But when and why would Barlow tell him that? The only reasonable answer is that he told him at or some time after the meeting at Potter's dinner party in the context of how and why he, Barlow, assumed that Gordon was dead. Outside the context of a confession of ignorance as to Gordon's survival, Barlow's telling of his mistake as to the other Gordon makes no sense at all. Their supposed deaths must therefore have been a subject of conversation between them. And such conversation would only have taken place if, as Gordon says repeatedly, they both thought each other dead. And if they both thought each other dead, which is the logical